



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MR. BURKITT'S "AQUILA."

*Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila from a MS. formerly in the Geniza at Cairo, now in the possession of C. Taylor, D.D., Master of St. John's College, and S. Schechter, M.A., University Reader in Talmudic Literature, edited for the Syndics of the University Press by F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A., with a preface by C. TAYLOR, D.D.: Cambridge, at the University Press, 1897.*

THE fortunate discovery of a fragment of the Hebrew Sirach has been followed by a second unexpected recovery, of not less importance for the criticism of the Old Testament. Among the treasures brought by Mr. Schechter from Cairo to Cambridge there were three leaves of a Hebrew palimpsest of the eleventh century. Underneath was visible a Greek text written in beautiful uncial characters, dating from the fifth or sixth century. On closer examination it was recognized that the MS. contained two passages from Aquila's Greek version of the Bible. In the fine volume before me, Mr. Burkitt has admirably published the contents of the three leaves, and has added the necessary information. After a short preface by Dr. Taylor, the editor reproduces the deciphered Greek text exactly in the form presented by the MS., with indication of the supplements to fill up the gaps of the Codex. Then follows a description of the Codex, and remarks on Aquila's relation to the original Hebrew text and to the LXX. Next, the text of the Fragments is repeated in the ordinary Greek script, with references to the Variants in the most important MSS. of the LXX. The editor then offers remarks on selected passages in the fragments. Six pages of facsimiles give an excellent idea of the appearance of the MS. One of the fragments contains Aquila's translation of 1 Kings xx. 7-17, the other of 2 Kings xxiii. 11-27.

There can be no doubt that we have the version of Aquila before us in these fragments. From the evidence of old writers, and from the citations derived from Origen's Hexapla, we know enough about the character of Aquila's work to be able to assert with certainty that these fragments belong to Aquila's and not to any other Greek translation of the Old Testament. The surest evidence is the exact correspondence with the traditional (Massoretic) text and the pedantic reproduction of the Hebrew original, a feature testified to have distinguished Aquila's work. Thus in the fragments the Hebrew mark of the accusative, **ל**, is rendered by *οὖν* with the accusative, a fact which Jerome cites as specially noteworthy and characteristic

in Aquila. **לֵאמֹר** is rendered τῷ λέγειν, though in the LXX the participle λέγων is commonly used. **אֲשֶׁר** is regularly rendered by the forms of the relative ὅς, while the LXX often uses a participle or the simple article. In 1 Kings xx. 9, **בְּרֵאשֵׁנָה** is, against all sense, literally translated ἐν πρώτῃ (LXX ἐν πρώτοις); xx. 12, **שִׁמּוֹ וַיְשִׁימוּ** θέτε· καὶ ἔθηκαν (LXX οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα· καὶ ἔθεντο χάρακα); xx. 14 **מִי־יֵאָסֵר הַמֶּלַחמָה** τίς δῆσει τὸν πόλεμον; (LXX τίς συνάψει τὸν πόλεμον;). In 2 Kings xxiii. 25, **לִפְנֵי** is rendered εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ (LXX ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ). Quite un-Greek is the combination of two prepositions, as in 2 Kings xxiii. 27, ἀπὸ ἐπὶ προσώπου for the Hebrew **מֵעַל פְּנֵי** (LXX ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου); and a similar remark applies to the combination of a preposition with an adverb, as in 2 Kings xxiii. 12, ἀπὸ ἐκείθεν for **מִשָּׁם**: cf. 1 Kings xiv. 15, ἀπὸ ἄνω τῆς χθονός = **מֵעַל הָאָרְצָה** in the Hexaplar version of the LXX, interpolated from Aquila. In 1 Kings xx. 12, 16, the Hebrew **בַּסִּכּוֹת** is here rendered ἐν συσκιασμοῖς; in the LXX the word is untranslated (the MSS. have ἐν Σοκχω or ἐν Σοκχωθ). That the word συσκιασμός, which is not found in ordinary Greek, is Aquila's term for rendering **סִכּוֹת** is precisely testified by Origen's Hexapla to Amos v. 26 and Ps. lx. 8. The Cairo fragment reads καὶ ἐδρόμωσεν ἀπὸ ἐκείθεν for the Hebrew **וַיִּרְץ מִשָּׁם** (2 Kings xxiii. 12); the translator therefore read וַיִּרְץ, not וַיִּרְץ as in the Massoretic vocalization. The word δρομοῦν, which otherwise never occurs, is a creation of Aquila's, and again occurs in Ps. lviii. 32, δρομόσει = **תִּרְצֵן**, and this rendering is in the Hexapla expressly ascribed to Aquila.

The close dependence on the Hebrew text is to be further noticed in the renderings of proper names, which agree almost throughout with the Massoretic text, except that ך and ך are not reproduced (e.g. Ααβ = **אַחַב**). In the LXX many names are grecized and the vocalization modified. Thus Aquila writes υἱὸς Αδαδ = **בֶּן־יָדָד**, the LXX υἱὸς Αδερ; Aquila Μενασσε = **מְנַשֶּׁה**, the LXX Μανασσης; Aquila Σελωμω or Σολωμω (the first vowel is uncertain in 2 Kings xxiii. 13), **שְׁלֹמֹה**, the LXX has Σολωμων or Σαλωμων; Aquila Νεβατ = **נְבָט**, LXX Ναβατ; Aquila Ιωσιαου = **יְהוֹשִׁיָּהוּ**, LXX Ιωσias; Aquila Ελκιαου = **חֶלְקִיָּהוּ**, LXX Χελκias; Aquila Βηθθλ = **בֵּית־לֶחֶם**, LXX Βαιθηλ; Aquila Φεσα = **פֶּסַח**, LXX Πασχα.

By far the most interesting peculiarity of the new fragments is the fact that the Tetragrammaton (**יהוה**) is not rendered κύριος as in the LXX, but is reproduced in the old Hebrew characters, but in such a way that the letters ' and ' have the same form. This is an unexpected confirmation of the statements of the Church Fathers. Origen (in his commentary to Ps. ii. 2) writes: καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐβραίοις χαρακτηῖται κείται τὸ ὄνομα, ἐβραϊκοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαϊστοῖς. So Jerome in the *Prolegus Galeatus*:

Nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus. We may now infer that this statement refers to MSS. of Aquila. Greek-speaking Jews substituted κύριος for the Tetragrammaton when reading the Scriptures aloud, just as Hebrew-speaking Jews used *Adonai*. The Cairo MS., as Mr. Burkitt well remarks, gives evidence of this. In one place (2 Kings xxiii. 24), at the end of a line where there was not enough room for writing the full Tetragrammaton, the scribe uses the contraction  $\kappa\upsilon$  (= κυρίου).

Small as the Cairo fragments are, they are still of priceless value for the criticism of the traditional Hebrew text and of the LXX. A comparison with the MT. shows that Aquila's text is, in general, identical with the text known to us to-day. For instance, in 1 Kings xx. 11, Aquila read דְּבַרִּי (as in our present text), for Aquila renders λαλήσατε, whereas the LXX version ἱκανούσθω (or ἱκανούσθω ὑμῖν) represents a reading רַב or רַב-לָכֶם. The number of variations between Aquila and the MT. is very small, and of these most are probably due to the Greek copyist. In 1 Kings xx. 7, וַיֹּאמֶר is untranslated, but probably καὶ εἶπεν (so LXX) has dropped out. Ibid. xx. 9, Aquila has ἀπέστειλεν (שָׁלַח) for שְׁלַחָה, (LXX rightly ἀπέστειλας or ἀπέσταλκας). In 2 Kings xxiii. 13, Aquila has τοῖς Ασθαρωθ, the MT. לַעֲשֵׂתָהָ, the LXX τῇ Ασταρτη. Ibid., Aquila τῷ Μολοχ (thus his reading was וַיִּלְמְלֵם), the MT. וַיִּלְמְלֵם; in the parallel passage, 1 Kings xi. 7, the MT. reads also וַיִּלְמְלֵם. In the present place, the LXX also read τῷ Μολοχ, for this is given by Lucian, and in a corrupt form by Cod. B (Μολχολ); only Cod. A, influenced as it was by the Hexaplar recension, has the reading, nearer the MT., τῷ Αμελχομ. 2 Kings xxiii. 16, Aquila has ὁ ἐλάλησεν ἀνὴρ τοῦ θεοῦ for אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים קָרָא, where he seems to have read דְּבַר for קָרָא (so the LXX ὁ ἐλάλησεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ). Ibid. xxiii. 18, the Cairo MS. has καὶ περιέσωσαν ὁστὰ τοῦ προφήτου for וַיַּמְלֵטוּ עַצְמוֹתַי אֶת עַצְמוֹת הַנְּבִיא. Here three words have probably dropped out through homoeoteleuton, Aquila having written καὶ περιέσωσαν ὁστὰ αὐτοῦ τὰ ὁστὰ τοῦ προφήτου. Sometimes the sign of the accusative, אֶת (usually rendered σύν by Aquila), is left untranslated. It is scarcely probable that in the Hebrew text used by Aquila the word אֶת failed in these places. It is safer to assume a copyist's error. Mr. Burkitt lays down the rule that Aquila only uses σύν when אֶת is followed by the Hebrew article or by כֵּל; when אֶת is not so followed, that is to say, before proper names, or substantives with suffixes or in the status constructus, Aquila replaces σύν by the Greek article. This rule seems accurate, if it be permissible to lay down general rules at all on the basis of such small

fragments. If this be so, then we must attribute to the carelessness of the copyist the omission of *σύν* in 2 Kings xxiii. 14 before *τὰς στήλας* (אֶת־הַפְּצֻבוֹת), and in xxiii. 16 before *τὰ δὲ σταῖ* (אֶת־הַעֲצָמוֹת).

Aquila's relation to the LXX can now be more closely defined on the basis of the Cairo fragments. We clearly see that he, like the other translators, used the LXX as his groundwork, that he borrowed their vocabulary and style, but that he compiled his version with close, verbal reference to that form of Hebrew text which in his day was considered canonical. Where he found this in agreement with the LXX Aquila adopted the latter without change. He also takes over expressions peculiar to the LXX: e.g. *προσόχισμα* = צִשְׁק, *παροργίζειν* = הִכְעִים, *παροργισμός* = בָּעַם (2 Kings xxiii. 26, *παροργισμοῖς* = הִכְעִים); 2 Kings xxiii. 15, *אֲשֶׁר הִחֲטִיִּי* אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל Aquila translates with the LXX *ὁς ἐξήμαρτεν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ*, though the verb *ἐξήμαρτεν* is not elsewhere used in this causative sense. Where the LXX translates freely, Aquila uses expressions nearer to the Hebrew, even though the phrases he uses may be foreign to Greek idiom. Thus 1 Kings xx. 10, *ὁς ἐν ποσὶν μου* = אֲשֶׁר בְּרַגְלִי (LXX *τοῖς πεσὺς μου*); *ibid.* xx. 11, *ζωννύμενος ὡς ὁ περιλυνόμενος* = חֲגִיר בְּמַפְתָּח (LXX *ὁ κυρτὸς ὡς ὁ ὀρθός*); 2 Kings xxiii. 19, *κατὰ πάντα τὰ ποιήματα* = הַמַּעֲשִׂים הַכֵּל (LXX *πάντα τὰ ἔργα*); *ibid.* xxiii. 24, *ἡ ἐωράθησαν* = אֲשֶׁר נִרְאִי (LXX *τὰ γεγονότα*). Aquila himself coins new words in order to reproduce a Hebrew expression more exactly, like the words *συσκιασμός* and *δρομοῦν* cited above. 2 Kings xxiii. 25 he renders *מֵאֲדוֹ וּבְכָל* by *καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σφοδρότητι αὐτοῦ*, which little accords with the real meaning, but his version results from his desire to retain *σφόδρα*, the ordinary Greek for *מֵאֲדוֹ*. The word *ברית* Aquila translates *συνθήκη*, LXX *διαθήκη*; *בְּמֶה* in Aquila is *ὑψωμα*, in LXX *τὸ ὑψηλόν*. Similarly, in 2 Kings xxiii. 15, for *אֲשֶׁר* Aquila has formed the word *ἄλσωμα*, while for the plural *אֲשֶׁרִים* Aquila, in agreement with the LXX, uses *τὰ ἄλση*. It is noteworthy that in 2 Kings xxiii. 24 Aquila renders *בָּעַר* *ἐπέλεξεν* (LXX *ἐξήρην*); similarly it was to Aquila that must be referred the renderings of the LXX Codex A, 1 Kings xiv. 10, *καὶ ἐπιλέξω . . . καθὼς ἐπιλέγεται* (בָּעַר כְּאֲשֶׁר יִבְעַר), and xxii. 47, *ἐπέλεξεν* (בָּעַר). So, too, in Deut. xxvi. 14, Aquila translates *בְּעֵרְתִּי* *ἐπέλεξα* (LXX *ἐκάρπωσα*). Is there here a mistake of the copyist, or a confounding with *בָּחַר*? The Hebrew *בָּחַר* is rendered by Aquila *καὶ γε* (as is sometimes the case also in the LXX), and he consequently translates *בָּחַר* pedantically *καὶ καὶ γε* (LXX *καὶ γε*).

For the criticism of the LXX and the restoration of its original form, the Aquila fragments are of great value, inasmuch as they confirm the conclusion of scholars that in both books of Kings the Codex Alexandrinus (A) contains a text revised in accordance with

the Hexapla of Origen, and thus can only be very cautiously trusted for information as to the true LXX. As is well known, the LXX in the Codex Vaticanus (B) and in Lucian's recension departs considerably from the Massoretic text in the two books of Kings, for it not only displays variations in reading, but it contains additions and makes omissions and transpositions. In the compilation of the Hexapla, Origen had a text similar to the Vatican Codex, and therefore, in order to bring the LXX into accord with the Hebrew, he took over into Rubric O' many readings and additions from other translations, and especially from Aquila, as the Cairo fragments now show. To such a revised Hexaplar text of the books of Kings, the text of the Cod. Alex. reverts, while B and Lucian remained almost free from such editing. Hence we frequently find that, in places where it differs from B and Lucian, A agrees with the Cairo MS. Thus 1 Kings xx. 10, *τάδε ποιήσαισάν μοι (οἱ) θεοὶ καὶ τάδε προσθείησαν* Aquila and A, while B and Lucian have *τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη*. Ibid. xx. 15 *τοὺς παῖδας (τῶν) ἀρχόντων* Aquila and A, but B *τοὺς ἄρχοντας τὰ παιδάρια*, Lucian *τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὰ παιδάρια τῶν ἀρχόντων*. Ibid. *ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας* Aquila and A, on the other hand B *ἑξήκοντα*, Lucian *ἑξήκοντα χιλιάδας*. 2 Kings xxiii. 12, *ἃ ἐποίησαν βασιλεῖς Ἰουδα* Aquila and A, on the other hand B and the Old-Latin translation *ἃ ἐποίησεν βασιλεὺς Ἰουδα*, Lucian *ἃ ἐποίησεν Ἀχαζ*. Ibid. xxiii. 22, *πασῶν ἡμερῶν* Aquila and A, but B *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*, Lucian *ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις*. Which of the two, B or the Lucian recension, stands closer to the original LXX needs further investigation. Lucian seems not to have been influenced by the Hexaplar text, but he himself introduced many changes (chiefly stylistic), and perhaps borrowed some readings from Theodotion's translation; for occasionally one finds in Lucian double readings and additions which betray a deviating text.

Aquila undertook a new translation of the Scriptures because what was then known as the LXX differed seriously from the received canonical Hebrew text, and thus the LXX gave room for false inferences, and could no longer satisfy the rigid requirements of the Rabbis. We need not wonder overmuch at the pedantic character of the translation, which not seldom does violence to Greek idiom. Aquila does not stand alone in this. Dr. Taylor refers to a similar example in the Middle Ages, viz. William de Moerbeke's Latin version of Aristotle's *Politics*. I would recall the Armenian translation of Philo's works, a translation which is so slavishly true to the original that only the individual words are Armenian, but the whole construction of the sentences is Greek, so that one can translate it word for word back into Greek. Since Aquila's version was prepared

under the authorization of recognized Rabbis, such as R. Joshua and R. Eliezer and R. Akiba, it found ready acceptance and popularity among Greek-speaking Jews, and replaced for them the old Alexandrian translation. We know that in the time of the Emperor Justinian Aquila's version was still in use among Greek Jews. Hence it is intelligible that a MS. of this translation lay long in Cairo, and that from this MS. a few leaves were saved in the Synagogue Geniza, and have now been so worthily given to the world by Mr. Burkitt.

LEOPOLD COHN.